



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,009	11/25/2003	Gary P. Raden	MS306091.1	6991
27195	7590	03/21/2008		
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER PATEL, HARESH N	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/21/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

doctet1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/722,009

Applicant(s)

RADEN ET AL.

Examiner

Haresh N. Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21-37, 39 and 42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 38, 40 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/19/04, 4/12/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-47 are presented for examination. Claims 1-20, 38, 40, 41, 43 are examined. Claims 21-37, 39 and 42 are withdrawn.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
- I. Claims 1-20, 38, 40, 41, 43, are drawn to, “providing information, at least in part, administrative guidance information corresponding to the networked system, the administrative guidance information containing, at least in part, recommendations for setting health monitor alert thresholds, the control of how notification occurs comprising control of at least one selected from the group consisting of an email, a paging device, and a direct user interface display, using a component, analysis component and user interface, etc., classified in class 709, subclass 224.
 - II. Claims 21-37, 39, 42, are drawn to, “acquiring, analyzing, adjusting parameters of a networked system based, at least in part, upon the information related to the desired parameter to automatically mitigate at least one effect of an errant system process, data mining the aggregated system health data to determine a prognosis of at least one aspect of the networked system, a data packet transmitted between two or more computer components that facilitates networked system health alert determination”, classified in class 719, subclass 310.
3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I to II, are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as, “providing information, at least in part, administrative guidance information corresponding to the networked system, the administrative guidance information containing, at least in part, recommendations for setting health monitor alert thresholds, the control of how notification occurs comprising control of at least one selected from the group consisting of an email, a paging device, and a direct user interface display, using a component, analysis component and user interface, etc.”, lacking one or more of the particulars of inventions II. Invention II has separate utility such as, “acquiring, analyzing, adjusting parameters of a networked system based, at least in part, upon the information related to the desired parameter to automatically mitigate at least one effect of an errant system process, data mining the aggregated system health data to determine a prognosis of at least one aspect of the networked system, a data packet transmitted between two or more computer components that facilitates networked system health alert determination”, lacking one or more of the particulars of inventions of I. See MPEP 806.05.

4. These inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, and the search required for each Group is different and not co-extensive for examination purpose. For example, the searches for the two inventions would not be co-extensive because these groups would require different searches on PTO's classification class and subclass as following:

(a) Group I search (claims 1-20, 38, 40, 41, 43) would require use of search class 709, subclass 224 (not required for the invention II).

(b) Group II search (claims 21-37, 39, 42) would require use of search class 719, subclass 310 (not required for the invention I).

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification as shown above, the extensive search required for one group is not required for the other groups as shown above, and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter as shown above, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. A telephone call was made to Mr. Amin Himanshu prior to this office action to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement. Mr. Amin Himanshu elected invention I with traverse.

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

8. Considering that elected Group I invention does not contain method claims, the applicant is requested to claim method claims including dependent claims that are similar to the claims that are elected for the examination.

Drawings

9. The figures submitted on 11/25/03 are acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

10. An initialed and dated copy of the applicant's IDS form 1449, paper dated 4/12/07, 4/19/04, is attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11. Claims 1-20, 40, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. The claim 1-20, 40, 41 do not fall into any of the statutory categories because the claims 1-20 and 40 claim a system without hardware components (see claim 41 specifying the components being software). Claim 41 contain computer readable medium, which should be --computer storage medium--, such as memory etc., that is limited to hardware. Note: claim 38 contains "means for", which means hardware components for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 1-20, 38, 40, 41, 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McCollum et al. 7,103,874 (Hereinafter McCollum).

14. Referring to claim 1, McCollum a system that facilitates health monitoring of a networked system (e.g., col., 2), comprising: a component that obtains aggregated system health data for at least one system component (e.g., col., 2); an analysis component that processes the aggregated system health data to provide an average value of a desired data parameter (e.g., col., 3); and a user interface that provides information related to the desired data parameter to a user (e.g., col., 3).

15. Referring to claim 2, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the system component comprising a server (e.g., col., 3).

16. Referring to claim 3, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the information comprising, at least in part, at least one alert based on utilization of the average value of the desired parameter and a substantially instantaneous value of the desired data parameter (e.g., col., 4).

17. Referring to claim 4, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the information comprising, at least in part, health monitoring alerts (e.g., col., 3).

18. Referring to claim 5, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the information comprising, at least in part, administrative guidance information corresponding to the networked system (e.g., col., 5).

19. Referring to claim 6, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the administrative guidance information comprising, at least in part, recommendations for setting health monitor alert thresholds (e.g., col., 6).

20. Referring to claim 7, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the information related to the desired data parameter comprising a rolling time-averaged value of the desired data parameter and a current health monitor alert threshold setting related to the desired data parameter (e.g., col., 4).

21. Referring to claim 8, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the rolling time-averaged value comprising a time averaged value over a 30 day time period (e.g., col., 4).

22. Referring to claim 9, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

McCollum also discloses the average value comprising a rolling time-averaged value (e.g., col., 4).

23. Referring to claim 10, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

McCollum also discloses the rolling time-averaged value comprising a time averaged value over a 30 day time period (e.g., col., 5).

24. Referring to claim 11, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

McCollum also discloses the user interface comprising a customizable user interface (e.g., col., 3).

25. Referring to claim 12, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

McCollum also discloses the user interface comprising an interactive user interface (e.g., col., 4).

26. Referring to claim 13, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

McCollum also discloses the interactive user interface comprising a user interface that provides an input for setting a health monitor alert threshold value (e.g., col., 6).

27. Referring to claim 14, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

McCollum also discloses the interactive user interface comprising a user interface that provides control of health monitor alerts (e.g., col., 5).

28. Referring to claim 15, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the control of the health monitor alerts comprising control of at least one selected from the group consisting of when health monitor alerts are displayed and what health monitor alerts are displayed (e.g., col., 4).

29. Referring to claim 16, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the control of the health monitor alerts comprising control of health monitor alert notification (e.g., col., 5).

30. Referring to claim 17, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the control of the health monitor alert notification comprising control of who is notified when a health monitor alert occurs (e.g., col., 4).

31. Referring to claim 18, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the control of who is notified comprising at least one selected from the group comprising a system administrator of the networked system and an owner of the networked system (e.g., col., 5).

32. Referring to claim 19, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the control of the health monitor alert notification comprising control of how notification occurs (e.g., col., 6).

33. Referring to claim 20, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses the control of how notification occurs comprising control of at least one selected from the group consisting of an email, a paging device, and a direct user interface display (e.g., col., 7).

34. Referring to claim 38, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses a system that facilitates health monitoring of a networked system (e.g., col., 2), comprising: means for obtaining aggregated system health data for at least one system component (e.g., col., 2); means for processing the aggregated system health data to provide an average value of a desired data parameter; and means for providing information related to the desired data parameter to a user (e.g., col., 3).

35. Referring to claim 40, 41, 43, McCollum discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. McCollum also discloses a system employing at least one system of claim 1 that provides a unified information source of health monitoring data for a plurality of networked systems (e.g., col., 2). A computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable components of the system of claim 1 (e.g., col., 2). A device employing the system of claim 1 comprising at least one selected from the group consisting of a computer, a server, and a handheld electronic device (e.g., col., 2).

36. Claims 1-20, 38, 40, 41, 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Ginter et al. 2005/0015624 (Hereinafter Ginter).

37. Referring to claim 1, Ginter a system that facilitates health monitoring of a networked system (e.g., page 7), comprising: a component that obtains aggregated system health data for at least one system component (e.g., page 7); an analysis component that processes the aggregated system health data to provide an average value of a desired data parameter (e.g., page 8); and a user interface that provides information related to the desired data parameter to a user (e.g., page 8).

38. Referring to claim 2, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the system component comprising a server (e.g., page 8).

39. Referring to claim 3, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the information comprising, at least in part, at least one alert based on utilization of the average value of the desired parameter and a substantially instantaneous value of the desired data parameter (e.g., page 9).

40. Referring to claim 4, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the information comprising, at least in part, health monitoring alerts (e.g., page 8).

41. Referring to claim 5, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the information comprising, at least in part, administrative guidance information corresponding to the networked system (e.g., page 10).

42. Referring to claim 6, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the administrative guidance information comprising, at least in part, recommendations for setting health monitor alert thresholds (e.g., page 11).

43. Referring to claim 7, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the information related to the desired data parameter comprising a rolling time-averaged value of the desired data parameter and a current health monitor alert threshold setting related to the desired data parameter (e.g., page 9).

44. Referring to claim 8, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the rolling time-averaged value comprising a time averaged value over a 30 day time period (e.g., page 9).

45. Referring to claim 9, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the average value comprising a rolling time-averaged value (e.g., page 9).

46. Referring to claim 10, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the rolling time-averaged value comprising a time averaged value over a 30 day time period (e.g., page 10).

47. Referring to claim 11, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the user interface comprising a customizable user interface (e.g., page 8).

48. Referring to claim 12, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the user interface comprising an interactive user interface (e.g., page 9).

49. Referring to claim 13, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the interactive user interface comprising a user interface that provides an input for setting a health monitor alert threshold value (e.g., page 11).

50. Referring to claim 14, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the interactive user interface comprising a user interface that provides control of health monitor alerts (e.g., page 10).

51. Referring to claim 15, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the control of the health monitor alerts comprising control of at least one selected from the group consisting of when health monitor alerts are displayed and what health monitor alerts are displayed (e.g., page 9).

52. Referring to claim 16, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the control of the health monitor alerts comprising control of health monitor alert notification (e.g., page 10).

53. Referring to claim 17, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the control of the health monitor alert notification comprising control of who is notified when a health monitor alert occurs (e.g., page 9).

54. Referring to claim 18, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the control of who is notified comprising at least one selected from the group comprising a system administrator of the networked system and an owner of the networked system (e.g., page 10).

55. Referring to claim 19, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the control of the health monitor alert notification comprising control of how notification occurs (e.g., page 11).

56. Referring to claim 20, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses the control of how notification occurs comprising control of at least one selected from the group consisting of an email, a paging device, and a direct user interface display (e.g., page 12).

57. Referring to claim 38, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses a system that facilitates health monitoring of a networked system (e.g., page 7), comprising: means for obtaining aggregated system health data for at least one system component (e.g., page 7); means for processing the aggregated system health data to provide an average value of a desired data parameter; and means for providing information related to the desired data parameter to a user (e.g., page 8).

58. Referring to claim 40, 41, 43, Ginter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Ginter also discloses a system employing at least one system of claim 1 that provides a unified information source of health monitoring data for a plurality of networked systems (e.g., page 7). A computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable components of the system of claim 1 (e.g., page 7). A device employing the system of claim 1 comprising at least one selected from the group consisting of a computer, a server, and a handheld electronic device (e.g., page 7).

59. Claims 1-20, 38, 40, 41, 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Richter et al. 2003/0046396 (Hereinafter Richter).

60. Referring to claim 1, Richter a system that facilitates health monitoring of a networked system (e.g., page 6), comprising: a component that obtains aggregated system health data for at

least one system component (e.g., page 6); an analysis component that processes the aggregated system health data to provide an average value of a desired data parameter (e.g., page 7); and a user interface that provides information related to the desired data parameter to a user (e.g., page 7).

61. Referring to claim 2, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the system component comprising a server (e.g., page 7).

62. Referring to claim 3, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the information comprising, at least in part, at least one alert based on utilization of the average value of the desired parameter and a substantially instantaneous value of the desired data parameter (e.g., page 8).

63. Referring to claim 4, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the information comprising, at least in part, health monitoring alerts (e.g., page 7).

64. Referring to claim 5, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the information comprising, at least in part, administrative guidance information corresponding to the networked system (e.g., page 10).

65. Referring to claim 6, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the administrative guidance information comprising, at least in part, recommendations for setting health monitor alert thresholds (e.g., page 11).

66. Referring to claim 7, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the information related to the desired data parameter comprising a rolling time-averaged value of the desired data parameter and a current health monitor alert threshold setting related to the desired data parameter (e.g., page 8).

67. Referring to claim 8, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the rolling time-averaged value comprising a time averaged value over a 30 day time period (e.g., page 8).

68. Referring to claim 9, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the average value comprising a rolling time-averaged value (e.g., page 8).

69. Referring to claim 10, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the rolling time-averaged value comprising a time averaged value over a 30 day time period (e.g., page 10).

70. Referring to claim 11, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the user interface comprising a customizable user interface (e.g., page 7).

71. Referring to claim 12, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the user interface comprising an interactive user interface (e.g., page 8).

72. Referring to claim 13, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the interactive user interface comprising a user interface that provides an input for setting a health monitor alert threshold value (e.g., page 11).

73. Referring to claim 14, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the interactive user interface comprising a user interface that provides control of health monitor alerts (e.g., page 10).

74. Referring to claim 15, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the control of the health monitor alerts comprising control of at least one selected from the group consisting of when health monitor alerts are displayed and what health monitor alerts are displayed (e.g., page 8).

75. Referring to claim 16, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the control of the health monitor alerts comprising control of health monitor alert notification (e.g., page 10).

76. Referring to claim 17, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the control of the health monitor alert notification comprising control of who is notified when a health monitor alert occurs (e.g., page 8).

77. Referring to claim 18, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the control of who is notified comprising at least one selected from the group comprising a system administrator of the networked system and an owner of the networked system (e.g., page 10).

78. Referring to claim 19, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the control of the health monitor alert notification comprising control of how notification occurs (e.g., page 11).

79. Referring to claim 20, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses the control of how notification occurs comprising control of at least one selected from the group consisting of an email, a paging device, and a direct user interface display (e.g., page 12).

80. Referring to claim 38, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses a system that facilitates health monitoring of a networked system (e.g., page 6), comprising: means for obtaining aggregated system health data for at least one system component (e.g., page 6); means for processing the aggregated system health data to provide an

average value of a desired data parameter; and means for providing information related to the desired data parameter to a user (e.g., page 7).

81. Referring to claim 40, 41, 43, Richter discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Richter also discloses a system employing at least one system of claim 1 that provides a unified information source of health monitoring data for a plurality of networked systems (e.g., page 6). A computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable components of the system of claim 1 (e.g., page 6). A device employing the system of claim 1 comprising at least one selected from the group consisting of a computer, a server, and a handheld electronic device (e.g., page 6).

Conclusion

In order to expedite the prosecution of this case, multiple references are used for the rejections to demonstrate that several references disclose the claimed subject matter of the claims.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the

claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Haresh N. Patel/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154

3/14/08